

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. 10/584,299	Applicant(s) WANG ET AL.	
	Examiner MICHAEL LEONARD	Art Unit 1796	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael Leonard.

(3) Matt Jacob.

(2) Nathan Nutter.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 12 August 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wamprecht and Miller.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

*Nathan Nutter*

/MICHAEL LEONARD/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1796

Primary Examiner A.U. 1796

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Claim 1 will be cancelled. Claim 2 was discussed in reference to the Wamprecht reference, it was noted that the Wamprecht reference does not disclose acrylic end groups on the urethane structure and therefore does not anticipated the claimed reference. The Wamprecht 102 and 103 rejections will have to be withdrawn and another search will be conducted. Other issues included cleaning up the language to limit terms such as obtainable by and preferably.